

RUBBER CO. SPIES BALK U. S. CONSUL

Foot-steps of Man Sent to Investigate Atrocities in Putumayo District.

NATIVES DARE NOT TALK

Official Slavery Exists, Official Finds—His Report Soon Goes to Congress.

Washington, Jan. 27.—That a system of espionage upon the part of agents of the Peruvian-Amazon Rubber Company had been discovered by the investigation conducted by Stuart J. Fuller, United States consul in the Putumayo rubber district of Peru last summer will be disclosed when his report to the State Department is transmitted to Congress next week. With this report will be other information regarding atrocities committed by agents of the rubber company against the native Indian laborers.

Although Mr. Fuller's report is being regarded carefully at the State Department, the State correspondent learns that Consul Fuller charges that the agents of the Peruvian-Amazon company did everything possible to prevent the getting any information regarding the atrocities.

Mr. Fuller has even entered the Putumayo district. Mr. Fuller found himself welcomed with the company of representatives of the Peruvian-Amazon Rubber Company, the British concern which holds the concession for gathering the rubber of that region, but as he was travelling on one of the company's sampans he could make no objections to the presence of the company's agents.

Moreover, when the rubber fields were reached Mr. Fuller discovered that every conversation he attempted to hold with the Indians was listened to by men in the pay of the rubber company. Seeing the company men present, the Indians refused to talk. Consequently Mr. Fuller was unable to obtain the evidence he sought. His report will show, however, that even had cruel practices been going on when he was in the Putumayo, it would hardly have been able to disclose them.

Furthermore, not only Mr. Fuller's report but also other documents being sent to the State Department for transmission to Congress will show that the agents, regardless of any strikes, are being worked by the rubber company's agents under a system differing very little from slavery. Mr. Fuller's report also shows that the rubber of the Putumayo is being gathered in regions where the natives are being civilized, and where the Indians can successfully gather the rubber; that the risks to life in the fields are so great that the worst kind of adventures have become practically the only kind of man the company can get as supervisors; that impelled by the great risks they are taking, together with the remoteness from the restraining influence of civilization, these agents have been accustomed to go almost any lengths to gain greater sums from the company in commissions on the value of the rubber gathered.

Consul Fuller was last year appointed United States consul in Iquitos, Peru, on the special mission of investigating the conditions in the Putumayo. Iquitos is the great head port of the Amazon river, and the Amazon River, and it is one of the chief ports for rubber from the upper Amazon. Though only a few hundred miles from Lima, the capital of Peru, it is in effect by virtue of the Andes mountains thousands of miles from the seat of the Peruvian Government. Mr. Fuller was specially commissioned to ascertain the effectiveness of certain administrative reforms which Peru in response to representations from the United States and Great Britain was said to have adopted for the regulation of the Putumayo region.

On August 6 Consul Fuller left Iquitos for the Putumayo, accompanied by G. H. Mitchell, British Consul at Iquitos, and a party of five. The party were met by the Prefect that the Peruvian Government would accompany them on the trip. They were joined not only by a Peruvian official but by Senor Arana, president of one of the heads of the Peruvian-Amazon company, and by Marzetti, brother of Pablo Zamato, who gathered largely in the Putumayo district since the cessation of hostilities. The company of these men was not desired by either Mr. Mitchell or Mr. Fuller, the British Consul.

Mr. Fuller was of course, that the natives got practically no information. These men followed them throughout their entire journey. They would only talk to the natives if the natives were depend on the natives for information. This source of information was consequently shut off by the espionage conducted by the company's men.

Consul Fuller spoke to the natives through an interpreter, and he found that a company man would at their elbow to listen, and connect with the company men well known to the Indians, who were used by their taskmasters, were used to speak frankly to the Consul.

The conclusion was reached that the natives very probably was not at all ignorant any so long organized ill treatment of the Indians, the company made it impossible for investigation to learn whether atrocities were committed or not. Upon their return to Iquitos both men drew up and a joint statement setting forth the company's agents had made completely fruitless their investigations.

Mr. Fuller arrived in Washington after a month's leave spent at his home in Wisconsin. It is not yet known when he will return to Iquitos or not.

WOMAN DROWNS IN AUTO.

Motorists Run Away After Collision, Leaving Others in Peril.

Norfolk, Va., Jan. 27.—Two automobiles crashed together on Tamers Creek Bridge at 3 o'clock this morning, causing the death of Florence Robinson of Alexandria, Ruth Etheridge, H. T. Wright and J. W. Crobaugh were rescued.

W. S. Jenkins, an overseer who was on the bridge, says that one of the cars only stopped long enough after the collision to pull one man out of the water and left the others to drown. Jenkins rescued Miss Etheridge and Wright.

Following the crash the car in which Florence Robinson was a passenger plunged through the railing and dropped to the water twenty feet below.

JULIA MARLOWE ILL OF POISON.

Steps Acting for Two Weeks to Recover Her Health.

Chicago, Jan. 27.—Julia Marlowe arrived in Chicago today and went to the home of a friend at 2332 Commonwealth avenue, where it was announced that she would remain for two weeks, resting and recuperating from an attack of poisoning with which she was seized in St. Louis on Friday night.

Her husband, E. H. Sothern, will continue to play Miss Marlowe's Chopin and tour with Miss Marlowe's roles.

SHOT MAN IN CHASE AFTER STOLEN AUTO

Mounted Police Send Several Bullets After Car in Two Mile Pursuit.

George Nyle, 24, of 61 West Ninety-third street was shot in the neck at midnight last night as he was riding in a stolen automobile in The Bronx with a party young men who were trying to escape from mounted officers. He was taken to the Fordham Hospital in a serious condition a prisoner.

John Plunkin, 23, of 226 West 142d street was run down by the machine and he went to the hospital suffering from cuts and lacerations.

Nyle's companions were arrested and locked up in the Harmonia police station on a charge of grand larceny. They described themselves as William Smith, 22, of 325 West 148th street; Albert Gayton, 19, of 608 St. Nicholas avenue; William Smith, 22, of 176 East Eighty-third street, and John McLaughlin, 27, of 2713 Eighth avenue. Nyle was also held a prisoner.

Dr. Charles V. Farrow, of 182d street and Riverside Drive, reported to the West Forty-seventh street police yesterday that his courier car carrying license No. 11825 had been stolen from Sixty-sixth street and Central Park West, and a general alarm was sent out for it.

Just about midnight Sgt. Sergeant John Carney was talking with Mounted Officer Carney at Burnside and Jerome avenues. The Bronx about the stolen machine, an auto rolled by at an easy gait. Carney espied the number on the rear of the machine and said to Carney: "There goes your machine now." Police-man O'Keefe of the Alexander station had joined his fellow officers while waiting for a car and he recognized the license number on the car.

All three called after the autoists to halt, but the man at the steering wheel on extra speed, and then Calman fired a shot in the air to scare them. O'Keefe sent another bullet whizzing over the heads of the men in the now swiftly moving car.

In the meantime Carney was speeding on his horse after the disappearing car. There was a race of a mile to the Fordham road, and then the police horses began to show signs of being winded.

Police-man Carney, fearing that his horse was going to give out, blew his police whistle and Mounted Police-man Smith, who was standing in the Fordham road, dashed up and took Carney's place in the chase. Smith shot several times in the direction of the auto, which was by this time going straight along Jerome road, and with his fresh horse was able to gain on it. He galloped for three-quarters of a mile to the Kingsbridge road, where he caught up to the fugitives.

Driving his horse ahead of the machine he wheeled the animal around and threatened to shoot the driver of the car. The man at the wheel shut off the power and the car came to a stop. Police-man Smith was joined by the other officers, who had lagged behind.

Nyle was found lying in the lap of one of his companions, faint from the loss of blood. There were several bullet holes in the woodwork of the machine and McLaughlin, one of the men in the car, had two bullet holes in his hat.

After the prisoner was locked up Dr. Paterno visited the station and identified the auto as his stolen machine.

LONDON POLICE IN SUFFRAGETTE RIOT

Women Keep Promise to Make Trouble Following Parliamentary Defeat.

SEVERAL ARRESTS MADE

Demonstrations in Trafalgar Square Broken Up With Difficulty.

Special Cable Dispatch to the Sun.

London, Jan. 27.—Making good their promise that if the manhood suffrage bill was killed in the House of Commons today they would renew their militant tactics, the suffragettes started trouble to-night. Several arrests were made at demonstrations of suffragettes, and according to Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, their leader, they will now go the limit in order to force the Government to give them the vote.

A crowd of 5,000 people witnessed strenuous efforts of the police to prevent the women from holding demonstrations in Trafalgar Square late to-night. As soon as the suffragettes scattered from the first meeting under the charge of the police they reassembled in another part of the square and again attempted to address the crowd. This was done repeatedly. The women raised their voices and sang, and the clanging served little purpose beyond attracting the police.

Mrs. Despard, an elderly suffragette, who has been conspicuous in the movement, took up a position on the steps of St. Martin-in-the-Fields just opposite the square. The police ordered her to move, but she refused to budge. Mrs. Despard was arrested with a man and two women who remained loyal to her side. All were taken to the Bow street police station, where they were held out for further appearance.

It seems that the suffragettes had agreed that in case they were arrested they would pose as wives of members of the Chamber of Commerce, and accordingly to-night gave her name as Lady Crowe, the wife of the Marquis of Crowe.

Shortly before midnight a young woman who was sitting in St. Stephen's Hall, a public part of the House of Commons, threw a stone at a painting on one of the walls. Her aim was good, for the glass was not broken and no damage was done. She was arrested, but was soon released. She was identified as Sylvia Pankhurst, the younger daughter of Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst.

The apprehensions of the police that the suffragettes would immediately resume their campaign of annoyance, possibly resorting to more violent tactics, apparently was justified by the declaration of Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, leader of the militants, as soon as she heard that the measure had been withdrawn.

"The action of Premier Asquith is a scandalous betrayal of the women of England, and we shall resume our militant activities unless the Government consents to introduce in the Parliament a bill specifically providing for equal suffrage," Mrs. Pankhurst declared.

At a meeting of the Women's Social and Political Union this evening Mrs. Pankhurst renewed her fulminations. She sharply rebuked those special tactics of militancy to which she had previously been personally responsible. She said that if it were to be successful it would have to be done with discretion. She added that while the suffragettes would regard human life as sacred they would stop at nothing short of destroying it and would use all methods resorted to in war.

Miss Annie Kenney, who has been very prominent in the manoeuvres of the militants, declared that the women would "make the lives of public men impossible," and in reply to an interrupter said:

"If you are a shopkeeper you had better look out. It is not just your windows which are going to be attacked. It is your very shop. We are going to get this question settled once for all."

Many shops have already begun to board up their windows.

The House of Commons was crowded this afternoon in expectation of an interesting scene at the death of the suffrage bill. It had become known that the cabinet in the Government had decided to drop the bill in consequence of the railing foreshadowed by the Speaker and woe.

When Premier Asquith announced the withdrawal of the measure it was received merely as a formal confirmation of a foregone conclusion. The point was that Sir Edward Grey's amendment moved to eliminate the word "male" in the provision for granting the suffrage to "all male persons" without property qualifications as heretofore.

Premier Asquith, in referring to the Speaker's statement which he said was a complete surprise to the Government, asked which amendment, if added to the bill, would constitute it a new measure and make necessary its re-introduction.

The Speaker, Mr. Lowther, replied that Sir Edward Grey's amendment would not have that effect, but either of the others, which would directly enfranchise women, would, as they provided for the addition of a large class to the electorate and would establish an entirely new principle.

Premier Asquith accepted the ruling without hesitation, although he said that he regretted the decision of the Speaker, as he had hoped there would be a discussion of the matter, to which he, as an opponent of woman suffrage, looked forward without the least fear of the result. The Government, however, he said, now realized that it would be useless to proceed with the bill.

The Premier went on to say, speaking of woman's suffrage, that there were now only two courses left open to the Government. One was to introduce a bill definitely enfranchising women, "and that," said the Prime Minister, "is the course which we have chosen."

Continued on Third Page.

MAY SEIZE ARCHBOLD ON TEXAS WARRANT

Wickersham May Withdraw Opposition to Arrest of Standard Oil Officers.

Washington, Jan. 27.—A statement issued by Attorney-General Wickersham to-night intimates that possibly John D. Archbold, W. C. Teague and H. C. Folger, Jr., of the Standard Oil Company and others may be arrested and taken to Texas for trial on indictments secured in the Federal court charging violation of the Sherman anti-trust law.

The indictments were returned in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas on June 27, 1912, on charges that the Standard Oil Company conspired with the Magnolia Petroleum Company, the latter a joint stock company of Texas, to restrain interstate trade of the Pierce-Fordyce Oil Association. A certified copy of the indictment was forwarded to the United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York and bench warrants for the arrest of Messrs. Archbold, Teague and Folger were issued.

After Mr. Wickersham's attention had been called to the meagre character of the evidence on which the indictments were founded he directed the United States Marshal not to execute the warrants until he received further instructions.

For indeed, if you stop to think about it, nothing could be a further departure from original Americanism, from faith in the ability of a State to govern itself, and from the respect for the discouraging doctrine that somebody has got to provide prosperity for the rest of us. And yet that is exactly the doctrine on which the Government of the United States has been conducting its policy in the great railroad and oil fields.

The masters of the Government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States. It is written over every intimate page of the records of Congress, the Executive and the history of conferences at the White House, that the suggestions of economic policy in this country have come from one source, not from many sources. The best of them have been the kindhearted trustees who have taken the control of government off our hands, have become so conscious that almost anybody can write out a list of them. They have become so conscious that their names are mentioned upon almost every political platform.

We have taken the interesting job of taking care of us do not force us to renege them with anonymously directed gratitude. We know them by name.

Suppose you go to Washington and try to get the Government to do for other men find that, while you are politely listened to, the men really consulted are the men who have the biggest stake—the big bankers, the big manufacturers, the big masters of commerce, the heads of railroad corporations and the heads of oil companies.

The Government of the United States at present is a foster child of the special interests. It is not allowed to have a will of its own. It is told at every move: "Don't do that, it will interfere with our prosperity." And when we ask, "Where is our prosperity lodged?" a certain group of gentlemen say, "With us." The Government of the United States in recent years has not been administered by the common people of the United States.

Now, I don't want a smug lot of experts to sit down behind closed doors in Washington and play Providence to me. There is a Providence to which I am perfectly willing to submit. But as for other men setting up as Providence over myself, I seriously object. I never came out of a committee meeting or a conference without seeing more of the question that was under discussion than I had seen when I went in. And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

WILSON REPUDIATES SPECIAL INTERESTS

"Freemen Need No Guardians," Title He Selects for a Notable Article.

MASTERS OF GOVERNMENT

President-elect Says They Have Been the Capitalists and Manufacturers.

"The Government of the United States at present is a foster child of the special interests," Woodrow Wilson says in an article, "Freemen Need No Guardians," in the February World's Work. He says that our working theory of late has been Alexander Hamilton's theory that the only men qualified to conduct the Government were the men who had the biggest financial stake in the country's commercial and industrial enterprises.

"Hamilton was a great man but in my judgment not a great American," comments the President-elect.

He does not object to men like big bankers and big manufacturers being consulted at Washington, but he does object to their being chiefly consulted and to compliance with their demands in every critical question. He insists that in every matter affecting the whole public the interests of the whole country be consulted.

As a matter of fact, Gov. Wilson observes, the thought of these big men does not cover the processes of their own undertakings. He says that as his own president he learned "that the men who dominate our manufacturing processes could not conduct their business for twenty-four hours without the assistance of the experts with whom the universities are supplying them."

For his part Gov. Wilson says he absolutely rejects the trustee theory. He does not challenge the character of the men who he says want to be commissioned to take care of the Government and the people, but he does challenge their point of view. He says that "we have not governed in the last generation, by men who occupy so narrow, so prejudiced, so limited a point of view." He refers to his experience as president of Princeton as a case in which he could have accomplished more by dealing directly with the university than with a board of trustees.

Parts of Gov. Wilson's article follow:

For indeed, if you stop to think about it, nothing could be a further departure from original Americanism, from faith in the ability of a State to govern itself, and from the respect for the discouraging doctrine that somebody has got to provide prosperity for the rest of us. And yet that is exactly the doctrine on which the Government of the United States has been conducting its policy in the great railroad and oil fields.

The masters of the Government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States. It is written over every intimate page of the records of Congress, the Executive and the history of conferences at the White House, that the suggestions of economic policy in this country have come from one source, not from many sources. The best of them have been the kindhearted trustees who have taken the control of government off our hands, have become so conscious that almost anybody can write out a list of them. They have become so conscious that their names are mentioned upon almost every political platform.

We have taken the interesting job of taking care of us do not force us to renege them with anonymously directed gratitude. We know them by name.

Suppose you go to Washington and try to get the Government to do for other men find that, while you are politely listened to, the men really consulted are the men who have the biggest stake—the big bankers, the big manufacturers, the big masters of commerce, the heads of railroad corporations and the heads of oil companies.

The Government of the United States at present is a foster child of the special interests. It is not allowed to have a will of its own. It is told at every move: "Don't do that, it will interfere with our prosperity." And when we ask, "Where is our prosperity lodged?" a certain group of gentlemen say, "With us." The Government of the United States in recent years has not been administered by the common people of the United States.

Now, I don't want a smug lot of experts to sit down behind closed doors in Washington and play Providence to me. There is a Providence to which I am perfectly willing to submit. But as for other men setting up as Providence over myself, I seriously object. I never came out of a committee meeting or a conference without seeing more of the question that was under discussion than I had seen when I went in. And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential a government presides over the process of their control of my life.

And that, to my mind, is an asset of government. I am not willing to be under the patronage of the trusts, no matter how providential